



Administrator Evaluation Dashboards

Accessible through EVAAS

December 5, 2013:

Restricted release to EVAAS district
administrators

December 11, 2013:

Release to all NC administrators

About the Administrator Evaluation Dashboard:

The administrator evaluation dashboard in EVAAS provides every NC administrator with a customized view of his or her ratings on Standards 1 – 8 of the NC Educator Evaluation System. The dashboard will also allow educators to track their progress toward an overall educator effectiveness status.

Accessing the Administrator Evaluation Dashboard:

For administrators, click Evaluation Dashboard under the Reports option.



Copyright © 2013 SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA. All Rights Reserved.

For EVAAS district administrators, click Evaluation Dashboard Administrator List under the Reports option.



More Information about the Administrator Evaluation Dashboard:

If you have any questions about policy around the use of EVAAS in NC's educator effectiveness model, or educator effectiveness in general, please email educatoreffectiveness@dpi.nc.gov.

For technical assistance with EVAAS accounts or questions about the reports, please click on Contact Us at <https://ncdpi.sas.com>.

Components of the Administrator Evaluation Dashboard:

The following is a sample administrator evaluation dashboard for an administrator at a school with student growth data.

For the 2012-13 school year, school administrators receive a Standard Eight rating based on the school-wide educator effectiveness growth value. The school-wide educator effectiveness growth value measures student growth across all of the End-of-Course assessments, End-of-Grade assessments, NC Final Exams, and Career and Technical Education Assessments administered in a school.

Standard	Status				
Standard One: Strategic Leadership	Not Demonstrated	Developing	Proficient	Accomplished	Distinguished
Standard Two: Instructional Leadership	Not Demonstrated	Developing	Proficient	Accomplished	Distinguished
Standard Three: Cultural Leadership	Not Demonstrated	Developing	Proficient	Accomplished	Distinguished
Standard Four: Human Resource Leadership	Not Demonstrated	Developing	Proficient	Accomplished	Distinguished
Standard Five: Managerial Leadership	Not Demonstrated	Developing	Proficient	Accomplished	Distinguished
Standard Six: External Development Leadership	Not Demonstrated	Developing	Proficient	Accomplished	Distinguished
Standard Seven: Micro-political Leadership	Not Demonstrated	Developing	Proficient	Accomplished	Distinguished
Standard Eight: Academic Achievement Leadership Fewer Details					
Base Year 2011 - 2012 School-wide Growth: 3.23 Year Growth: 3.23	Does Not Meet Expected Growth		Meets Expected Growth	Exceeds Expected Growth	
School Year 2012 - 2013 Year Growth: 1.45	Does Not Meet Expected Growth		Meets Expected Growth	Exceeds Expected Growth	
School Year 2013 - 2014	Does Not Meet Expected Growth		Meets Expected Growth	Exceeds Expected Growth	
School Year 2014 - 2015	Does Not Meet Expected Growth		Meets Expected Growth	Exceeds Expected Growth	
Average of Strongest Two Years ***	Does Not Meet Expected Growth		Meets Expected Growth	Exceeds Expected Growth	
Overall Status	Needs Improvement		Effective	Highly Effective	
<p>*** In October 2013, the State Board of Education approved a policy change for the determination of an overall educator effectiveness status of effective, highly effective, or in need of improvement. For administrators with educator effectiveness school-wide growth values in the 2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15 school years, the two strongest years of growth data will be used to determine an overall effectiveness status. This policy revision represents a change from the original policy that a three-year average of student growth data would be used to determine the overall status. After the first statuses awarded in the Fall of 2015, the policy will again require the use of the three-year average rather than the use of the two strongest years of growth data. This policy change is contingent on approval from the United States Department of Education.</p>					

Copyright © 2013 SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA. All Rights Reserved.

Components of the Administrator Evaluation Dashboard:

Key

- 1: Introductory message that explains how an administrator's Standard 8 rating is determined.
- 2: An administrator's ratings on Standards 1 – 7 of the NC Educator Evaluation System.
- 3: An administrator's Standard 8 rating from the 2011–12 school year. This rating will not be used to determine an overall effectiveness status.
- 4: An administrator's Standard 8 rating from the 2012–13 school year. The rating is based on the school-wide educator effectiveness growth value.
- 5: An administrator's Standard 8 ratings from the 2013–14 and 2014–15 school years.
- 6: An administrator's Standard 8 rating based on strongest two years of data from the 2012–13, 2013–14, and 2014–15 school years.
- 7: The overall status. NOTE: no educator will have status until after the 2014–15 school year, at the earliest. The box also includes language on the State Board of Education's decision to use the strongest two years of student growth data to determine the first overall effectiveness status.

Components of the Administrator Evaluation Dashboard:

The following is a sample administrator evaluation dashboard for an administrator at a school that takes the growth value of a feeder school.

For the 2012-13 school year, school administrators receive a Standard Eight rating based on the school-wide educator effectiveness growth value. The school-wide educator effectiveness growth value measures student growth across all of the End-of-Course assessments, End-of-Grade assessments, NC Final Exams, and Career and Technical Education Assessments administered in a school.

Standard	Status				
Standard One: Strategic Leadership	Not Demonstrated	Developing	Proficient	Accomplished	Distinguished
Standard Two: Instructional Leadership	Not Demonstrated	Developing	Proficient	Accomplished	Distinguished
Standard Three: Cultural Leadership	Not Demonstrated	Developing	Proficient	Accomplished	Distinguished
Standard Four: Human Resource Leadership	Not Demonstrated	Developing	Proficient	Accomplished	Distinguished
Standard Five: Managerial Leadership	Not Demonstrated	Developing	Proficient	Accomplished	Distinguished
Standard Six: External Development Leadership	Not Demonstrated	Developing	Proficient	Accomplished	Distinguished
Standard Seven: Micro-political Leadership	Not Demonstrated	Developing	Proficient	Accomplished	Distinguished
Standard Eight: Academic Achievement Leadership					
Fewer Details					
Base Year 2011 - 2012 School-wide Growth: -1.69 * Year Growth: -1.69	Does Not Meet Expected Growth	Meets Expected Growth	Exceeds Expected Growth		
School Year 2012 - 2013 Year Growth: 2.13 **	Does Not Meet Expected Growth	Meets Expected Growth	Exceeds Expected Growth		
School Year 2013 - 2014	Does Not Meet Expected Growth	Meets Expected Growth	Exceeds Expected Growth		
School Year 2014 - 2015	Does Not Meet Expected Growth	Meets Expected Growth	Exceeds Expected Growth		
Average of Strongest Two Years ***	Does Not Meet Expected Growth	Meets Expected Growth	Exceeds Expected Growth		
Overall Status	Needs Improvement Effective Highly Effective				
<p>** For the 2012 – 2013 school year, the eighth standard for administrators at K-3 schools is based on growth from the "feeder school" that has been previously designated for use in the NC school accountability model.</p> <p>*** In October 2013, the State Board of Education approved a policy change for the determination of an overall educator effectiveness status of effective, highly effective, or in need of improvement. For administrators with educator effectiveness school-wide growth values in the 2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15 school years, the two strongest years of growth data will be used to determine an overall effectiveness status. This policy revision represents a change from the original policy that a three-year average of student growth data would be used to determine the overall status. After the first statuses awarded in the Fall of 2015, the policy will again require the use of the three-year average rather than the use of the two strongest years of growth data. This policy change is contingent on approval from the United States Department of Education.</p>					

Copyright © 2013 SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA. All Rights Reserved.

Components of the Administrator Evaluation Dashboard:

Key

- 1: Introductory message that explains how an administrator's Standard 8 rating is determined.
- 2: An administrator's ratings on Standards 1 – 7 of the NC Educator Evaluation System.
- 3: An administrator's Standard 8 rating from the 2011–12 school year. This rating will not be used to determine an overall effectiveness status.
- 4: An administrator's Standard 8 rating from the 2012–13 school year. The rating is based on the school-wide educator effectiveness growth value from the feeder school used in the school accountability model and will not be used to determine the overall educator effectiveness status.
- 5: An administrator's Standard 8 ratings from the 2013–14 and 2014–15 school years.
- 6: An administrator's Standard 8 rating based on three years of data.
- 7: The overall status. NOTE: no educator will have status until after the 2014–15 school year, at the earliest. When applicable, the box also includes language on the use of feeder schools to determine the Standard 8 rating.

Reminders:

An administrator will only have access to an evaluation dashboard if there was a completed and signed summary rating form entered in the online NC Educator Evaluation System by the end of the 2012–13 school year.

An administrator will not be able to view his or her evaluation dashboard if he or she is working in a different school district or charter school than during the 2012–13 school year. The district EVAAS administrator at the school at which the administrator was employed during the 2012–13 school year will be able to view the evaluation dashboard.

A very small number of administrators will not have Standard 8 ratings. In these cases, the school at which he or she was employed did not have a school-wide growth value, and there is no feeder school with a school-wide growth value to connect to the administrator.